The Mini Alcohol Craving Experience Questionnaire: Development and clinical application

Jason M. Coates[1,2], Matthew J. Gullo[1,3], Gerald F.X. Feeney[1,3], David J. Kavanagh[4], Ross McD. Young[3,5], Genevieve A. Dingle[1,2], Jon May[6], Jackie Andrade[6], Dixie J. Statham[7], & Jason P. Connor[1,3,8]

[1] Centre for Youth Substance Abuse Research, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
[2] School of Psychology, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
[3] Alcohol and Drug Assessment Unit, Department of Medicine, Princess Alexandra Hospital, Brisbane, Australia
[4] Centre for Children's Health Research, Institute of Health & Biomedical Innovation and School of Psychology & Counselling, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia
[5] Faculty of Health Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia
[6] School of Psychology, Cognition Institute, Plymouth University, Plymouth, UK
[7] School of Social Sciences, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sunshine Coast, Australia
[8] School of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Corresponding Author:

Professor Jason Connor

Email: jason.connor@uq.edu.au

Address: Centre for Youth Substance Abuse Research, The University of Queensland, K-Floor Mental Health Centre, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane, Australia QLD 4029

This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following article:

***Coates, J. M., Gullo, M. J., Feeney, G. F.X., Kavanagh, D. J., Young, R. McD., Dingle, G. A., May, J., Andrade, J., Statham, D. J. and Connor, J. P. (2017), The Mini Alcohol Craving Experience Questionnaire: Development and Clinical Application. Alcohol Clin Exp Res, 41: 156–164. doi:10.1111/acer.13278*, which has been published in final form at DOI: 10.1111/acer.13278. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.**

ABSTRACT

Background: Standardised alcohol craving scales are rarely used outside of research environments despite recognised clinical utility. Scale length is a key barrier to more widespread application. A brief measure of alcohol craving is needed to improve research and treatment of Alcohol Use Disorders (AUDs). The Alcohol Craving Experience (ACE) questionnaire comprises two 11-item self-report scales based on strong theoretical and empirical foundations, which assess past-week frequency and maximum strength of alcohol craving. This study aimed to create a brief version of the ACE, while maintaining psychometric integrity and clinical utility.

Methods: Patients attending a university hospital alcohol and drug out-patient service for treatment of AUD completed the ACE as part of a questionnaire battery. Three patient samples were utilised: 519 patients with pre-treatment and outcome data; 228 patients with pre-treatment data; and 66 patients who completed the ACE at treatment sessions one and two. Psychometric assessments informing scale reduction and evaluation included predictive, construct, concurrent, and convergent validity, as well as internal and test-retest reliability.

Results: The Frequency version of the ACE was found to have greatest predictive utility. Revision of that measure produced a 5-item Mini Alcohol Craving Experience (MACE) questionnaire. Levels of predictive, construct, concurrent, and convergent validity were maintained in the reduced scale. High internal and test-retest reliability was also demonstrated.

Conclusions: The MACE provides a brief, theoretically and psychometrically robust measure of alcohol craving suitable for use with AUD populations in time-limited clinical and research settings.

Keywords: Alcohol Use Disorder, Craving, Urge, Measurement, Scale development

INTRODUCTION

Craving is a robust marker of substance dependence severity and is implicated in treatment relapse (Flannery et al., 2003; Law et al., 2016). The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5) recently included craving as a diagnostic criterion for Substance Use Disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Hasin et al., 2013). Craving interventions feature prominently in psychological treatments and pharmacotherapies have been developed to target specific craving neuromechanisms (Addolorato et al. 2005; Haass-Koffler et al. 2014). After decades of experimental, clinical, and epidemiological research, accurate measurement of substance craving remains a research priority (Tiffany and Wray 2012; Kavanagh et al. 2013). Historically, craving has been measured by conceptually weak and often unstandardised methods, limiting generalisability and clinical utility (Sayette et al. 2000; Pavlick et al. 2009; Kavanagh et al. 2013). Some standardised scales have been introduced, although uptake within clinical settings has been poor (Pavlick et al. 2009; Tiffany and Wray 2012).

A national survey of U.S. addiction services found 99% considered craving in treatment planning, yet only 5% employed standardised self-report craving measures (Pavlick et al. 2009). The majority opted for single-item or non-standard open ended questions, despite well documented limitations to the reliability of these approaches (Cortina 1993; Hruschka et al., 2004). This may reflect documented psychometric and theoretical weaknesses in self-report craving scales (Sayette et al. 2000; Kavanagh et al. 2013) and time burden imposed by scale administration and analysis in busy clinical environments. Alcohol Use Disorders (AUDs) are among the most prevalent Substance Use Disorders, placing a substantial burden upon global mortality and disease (Connor and Hall 2015; Gowing et al. 2015; Connor et al. 2016). A brief, psychometrically sound measure of alcohol craving is needed to improve assessment, diagnosis, and treatment of AUDs.

Current alcohol craving scales are subject to several common limitations, including: administration time, the absence of a coherent theoretical model, poor construct validity due to confounding psychological and behavioural constructs, and sub-optimal psychometric validation (Abrams 2000; Kavanagh et al. 2013). Reflecting the need for accurate measurement of craving, a number of new scales have been proposed: the Yale Craving Scale (YCS; Rojewski et al. 2015), a three-item craving measure (McHugh et al. 2016), and the Alcohol Craving Experience (ACE) Questionnaire (Statham et al. 2011). When considered for application in time limited environments no scale appears suitable. The YCS and ACE are limited by administration time. Construct validity of the YCS and McHugh et al.'s (2016) scale is restricted by the absence of a theoretical model. McHugh et al.'s (2016) scale also contains an item assessing drinking likelihood ("...what is the likelihood that you would drink today?"), confounding the validity of the scale as a craving measure. It is proposed that reduction of the ACE would result in a theoretically and psychometrically sound measure of craving which may be easily integrated in time-limited environments.

Reflecting the Elaborated Intrusion (EI) Theory of Desire (Kavanagh et al. 2005; May et al. 2014b), the ACE measures three aspects of craving: the intensity of the drive to drink (Intensity), the presence of associated imagery (Imagery), and intrusiveness of desire cognitions (Intrusion; Statham et al., 2011). EI theory defines craving as an affectively laden cognitive event, where an object or activity and its associated pleasure or relief is in focal attention (Kavanagh et al. 2005). Consistent with neurobiological models of craving addictive substances are believed to recruit the same physiological mechanisms that drive appetitive behaviours required for survival (Robinson and Berridge 1993). EI theory proposes that biological, environmental, and affective cues trigger intrusive desire-related cognitions which occupy attention and prompt elaboration. The subsequent elaboration process—in particular imagery—provides momentary pleasure or relief of physical and emotional discomfort

(Connor et al. 2014). However, pleasure or relief from elaborative cognitions quickly dissipates. Instead, awareness is drawn to any emotional or physical deprivation and to potential actions to acquire the target. Further elaboration and intensification of the desire ensues, unless the target is acquired or attention is captured elsewhere.

EI theory aligns with treatment approaches such as motivational enhancement, mindfulness, acceptance-based therapies, and retraining attentional biases (Witkiewitz et al. 2013; May et al. 2014b; Witkiewitz et al. 2014). Recent research has directly employed EI theory in the development of promising new craving management strategies and novel treatment approaches (Kemps and Tiggemann 2007; Knäuper et al. 2011; Kemps and Tiggemann 2013; Hsu et al. 2014; Skorka-Brown et al. 2014; Littel et al. 2016). These approaches employ non-substance imagery and sensory tasks designed to compete with craving-based imagery within the limited capacity of working memory. The information provided by the ACE, in conjunction with EI theory, may facilitate more detailed formulation, treatment planning, and monitoring of craving.

The ACE was originally developed in an AUD sample (Statham et al. 2011), to measure the frequency (ACE-F) and peak strength (ACE-S) of alcohol craving over the previous week. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis showed that the items in both forms of the ACE cluster into three distinct factors consistent with EI theory: Intensity, Imagery, and Intrusion of craving-related cognitions. The ACE has high internal reliability and significantly correlates with the Obsessive Compulsive Drinking Scale (OCDS), Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT), as well as measures of psychological distress highly comorbid with AUDs. The ACE has further been demonstrated to discriminate non-clinical from clinical samples (Statham et al. 2011). May and colleagues (2014) pooled 12 studies using modified forms of the ACE to assess craving across a range of substances, including alcohol (May et al. 2014a). The original factor structure was replicated across all

substances.

The ACE provides a theoretically grounded, psychometrically robust measure, with strong rationale for more effectively targeting alcohol craving interventions, and has shown its value in research settings. For clinical settings, however, the full ACE is both repetitive (with each item appearing in both the Strength and Frequency forms) and time consuming. A shorter version of the ACE is likely to result in higher uptake, especially where repeated administration is required. The aim of this study is to develop a short form of the ACE for use in treatment planning and outcome assessment without compromising its theoretical foundation or psychometric integrity.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

Three samples of data were drawn from patients attending a metropolitan university hospital alcohol and drug out-patient service. The service comprises eight sessions of Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT) conducted over 12 weeks. Treatment may be supplemented by pharmacotherapy (naltrexone, acamprosate or both). The assessment battery is completed in a separate consultation prior to the first treatment session, and again at the completion of treatment. All patients were over 18 years of age and met DSM-IV (American Psychiatric Association 2000) criteria for alcohol dependence. Human ethics approval was obtained (2008/125, HREC/12/QPAH/022 HREC/14/QPAH/664) and participants provided informed written consent. Sample characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Scale Reduction Sample. This sample comprised 519 alcohol dependent patients (Table 1). All patients were over 18 years of age and met DSM-IV(American Psychiatric Association 2000) criteria for alcohol dependence. These data have been used previously in

the original development of the ACE (Statham et al. 2011) and in examining craving as a mediator of change (Law, et al., 2016), but have not been used to directly predict treatment outcome.

Validation Sample. The validation sample comprised pre-treatment data from 228 consecutively treated alcohol dependent patients (Table 1). These data were employed to assess the factor structure of the ACE scales and cross-sectional relationships between variables.

Test-Retest (TRT) Sample. The ACE-F was administered to 66 patients at treatment sessions 1 and 2, in-order to assess test-retest reliability of the ACE-F. Mean time between sessions was 8.40 days (*SD* = 2.86).

Insert Table 1

Measures

The Alcohol Craving Experience (ACE) questionnaire. The ACE comprises two 11-item questionnaires that assess the frequency (ACE-F) or peak strength (ACE-S) of desire-related cognitions over the previous week. Items load onto three classes of cognition, 'Intensity' (items 1-3), 'Imagery' (items 4-8), and 'Intrusion' (items 9-11). Participants respond via an 11-point visual analogue scale with anchors 0 (*not at all*) and 10 (*constantly/extremely*). The ACE-F and ACE-S have good internal reliability and concurrent validity, and can discriminate between problem and non-problem drinkers (Statham et al. 2011).

The Obsessive Compulsive Drinking Scale (OCDS). The OCDS is a 14-item self-report measure intended to reflect drinking-related obsessive and compulsive craving and behaviour (Anton et al., 1995). The OCDS has acceptable test-retest reliability, internal reliability, and concurrent validity (Anton et al., 1995; Kranzler et al., 1999; Roberts et al., 1999). The first six items comprise the Obsessions Subscale (OBS), and are intended to assess drinking obsession related cognitions. As an assessment of pure craving the OBS has the greatest construct validity within the OCDS (Kavanagh et al. 2013). The remaining items, originally intended to reflect drinking compulsions, assess extraneous constructs such as consumption and interference with functioning. The OBS was utilised as a concurrent measure of craving.

The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT). The AUDIT is a 10-item, self-report measure assessing recent alcohol use, symptoms of alcohol dependence, and alcohol related problems (Saunders et al. 1993). The AUDIT has sound internal reliability, sensitivity and specificity, and discriminant validity (Saunders et al. 1993). Higher scores indicate increased risk of harmful or hazardous drinking.

The Beck Depression Inventory - Second Edition (BDI-II). The BDI-II is a 21-item self-report measure assessing attitudes and behaviours symptomatic of depression (Beck et al. 1996). The BDI-II is a well validated measure demonstrating strong test-retest and internal reliability, as well as good concurrent, content, discriminant, and construct validity (Beck et al. 1988; Beck et al. 1996).

The State Anxiety Scale (S-Anxiety). The S-Anxiety Scale of the State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) comprises 20 self-report items assessing the respondent's current state of

anxiety (Spielberger 1983). The S-Anxiety has acceptable internal and test-retest reliability, as well as content, discriminant, and construct validity (Spielberger 1983; Oei et al. 1990; Barnes et al. 2002).

Procedure

Scale Reduction. To best maintain consistency of the measured construct, an initial step involved selection of a form of the ACE for further refinement (ACE-F or ACE-S). Each form was evaluated based on perceived clinical utility and predictive validity. Decisions guiding subsequent item reduction were driven by: (a) face validity and theoretical importance within EI theory; (b) the endorsement of each item within the alcohol dependent sample; (c) the capacity for each item to discriminate between patients who lapsed or withdrew from treatment and those who were abstinent throughout treatment; and (d) the contribution of each item to a model predicting abstinent completion of treatment. Data analyses within this step utilised the Scale Reduction Sample.

Scale Evaluation. Reduced models were further evaluated based on construct, concurrent, and convergent validity, as well as internal and test-retest reliability. Data analysis within this step utilised the Validation and Test-Retest samples.

Scale Selection. The shortest scale maintaining psychometric integrity would be selected as the final reduced version.

Data Analysis

Analyses were conducted in SPSS version 22. Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted in R version 3.2.1(R Core Team 2015), package extension *lavaan* .5-18

(Rosseel 2012). As the distributions of all ACE item and scale scores were significantly negatively skewed, statistical procedures robust to non-normal distributions were utilised.

RESULTS

Scale Reduction

Subscale-Selection. As the ACE-S asks the respondent to report on only the most severe episode of past week craving, it is highly susceptible to contextual factors such as situational cues and novel stressors. Clinical value of this method is drawn from the isolation of a specific time-period where the patient may be most vulnerable to lapse. Alternatively, the ACE-F assesses the perceived frequency of craving symptoms over the past week, providing a more general overview of the patients craving experience. The ACE-F was subsequently identified as the preferred scale for reduction, based on its perceived benefit as a measure more sensitive to change in the patient's typical craving experience.

Using the Scale Reduction Sample, separate logistic regression analyses were employed to assess the capacity of each scale to predict the likelihood of treatment lapse or dropout, relative to patients who were abstinent throughout treatment. AUDIT scores and medication status were included as covariates, but did not significantly improve upon the intercepts-only model ($\Delta\chi^2$ (2) = 1.89, p = .910, *Nagelkerke* R^2 = .001). Inclusion of either the ACE-S ($\Delta\chi^2$ (1) = 17.80, p = <.001, *Nagelkerke* R^2 = .053) or ACE-F ($\Delta\chi^2$ (1) = 21.89, p = <.001, *Nagelkerke* R^2 = .065) significantly improved the predictive power of the model. When both measures were entered, ACE-F was the dominant predictor (β=.015, p=.039), while additional variance explained by the ACE-S was non-significant due to high covariance between the scales (β =.004, p=.525; $\Delta\chi^2$ (4) = 22.22, p = <.001, *Nagelkerke* R^2 = .065). The ACE-F was therefore selected for further refinement.

Item Importance. Prior to item reduction, the structure and items central to the theoretical foundation of the scale were considered. At least one item from each sub-scale was retained to represent each factor. Items 3 and 9 (Table 2) were prioritized for retention due to high semantic consistency to the Intensity and Intrusion factors respectively. Multiple items of the Imagery factor were retained to capture potential individual differences in the most prevalent imagery modalities involved in alcohol craving.

Feature Prevalence. Medians and interquartile ranges for all ACE-F items are presented in Table 2. While all items had an interquartile range of at least 4 on the 11-point scale, most also received a large proportion of 'not at all' responses. To identify which items were most representative of common craving symptoms among patients with AUD, the endorsement rates (proportion of non-zero responses to each item) were also calculated. McNemar's χ^2 was utilised to identify significant differences between items in the prevalence of endorsement rates within each factor. Within the Intensity factor, the endorsement rate of Item 2 (80.2%) was significantly lower than Item 3 (86.1%), while Items 1 (87.6%) and 3 could not be distinguished (p = .169). Comparisons of endorsement rates of items within the Imagery factor revealed all were significantly different (p<.001), with the exception of the two most highly endorsed (Items 4 and 8; p=.716). Within the Intrusion factor, item 11 was the least endorsed factor (75.8%, p<.001) while items 9 (84.9%) and 10 (83.8%) could not be differentiated (p=.291).

Insert Table 2

Separate Mann-Whitney *U* tests revealed that the mean rank of patients who lapsed or withdrew from treatment was significantly higher for every item than those who completed

treatment abstinent (Table 3). Steiger's *Z* revealed no significant differences in the size of the effects between items.

Insert Table 3

Item Reduction. Items with the highest endorsement rates were given greater priority for retention to reduce the number of 'not at all' responses within the reduced scale. Based on symptom prevalence and consistency with the overarching factors, items 3 and 9 were retained to represent the Intensity and Intrusion factors respectively. The three imagery items with the highest endorsement rates (4, 5, and 8) were retained to comprise the initial Imagery factor.

A sequential logistic regression was employed to assess the capacity for the selected items to predict alcohol lapse in the Scale Reduction Sample. The AUDIT score and prescription of anti-craving medication were again included in the baseline model. Inclusion of the items intended to comprise the reduced ACE (items 3, 4, 5, 8, 9) significantly improved the predictive power of the model above the AUDIT and medication ($\Delta\chi^2$ (5) = 19.50, p =.002, *Nagelkerke* R^2 = .065). To assess whether the model could be improved with the inclusion of additional ACE items, the remaining items were included using forward entry. This indicated that the sequential inclusion of items 1 ($\Delta\chi^2$ (1) = 8.82, p =.003, *Nagelkerke* R^2 = .085) and 10 ($\Delta\chi^2$ (1) = 8.79 p =.003) would significantly improve the final model ($\Delta\chi^2$ (9) = 37.192, p <.001, *Nagelkerke* R^2 = .110).

Scale Evaluation

Validity. To assess the construct validity of the initial five-item scale, the seven-item scale, and the complete ACE-F, confirmatory factor analyses were performed utilising the

Validation Sample. Maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors and a Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic were employed to reduce the effects of non-normality. For the 11 and 7 item scales, the three-factor solution provided a better fit to the data than a unifactorial model (Table 4). For the five item scale, both solutions showed comparable fit. These results support previous studies validating the three-factor structure of the ACE (Statham et al. 2011; May et al. 2014a), though when reduced to a five-item scale, it could equally reflect a global construct of craving within a single factor.

Insert Table 4

All scales had large positive correlations with the OBS, indicating an acceptable level of concurrent validity (Table 5). Convergent validity was demonstrated by small to moderate positive correlations with the AUDIT and moderate correlations with measures of psychological distress (STAI and BDI). The strength of the correlations did not significantly differ between the three ACE versions (Steiger's $Z > .05$) indicating that convergent and concurrent validity of the ACE was not significantly affected by scale reduction.

Insert Table 5

Reliability. Internal consistency was assessed using the Validation Sample. Reliability of all scales and subscales was strong, with only minor reductions within the reduced scales (Table 6). Test-Retest reliability utilised session one and two data from 66 patients. Correlations between session one and session two ACE scores indicated that test-retest reliability was acceptable across all scales (Table 6). Steiger's *Z* revealed no significant changes in scale test-retest reliability following reduction.

Insert Table 6

Scale Selection

The procedures conducted indicate that the ACE-F may be reduced to as few as five items while maintaining theoretical and psychometric integrity. The five-item scale, termed the Mini Alcohol Craving Experience (MACE), was chosen as the most suitable short-form scale for assessment of craving in AUD populations.

DISCUSSION

In place of the two 11–item forms of the ACE, a brief five-item measure of craving was validated (MACE). The MACE maintained high construct, predictive, concurrent, and convergent validity. High internal and test-retest reliability consistent with the ACE-F was also demonstrated. The MACE measures the frequency of past week craving including intense urges, imagery, and intrusiveness of craving related cognitions (Kavanagh et al., 2005). The MACE is simple to administer and may be completed in less than 60 seconds, reducing time burden on respondents, health professionals, and researchers.

In addition to its brevity, the MACE maintains several strengths uncommon among current craving instruments, including a strong theoretical model and absence of drinking constructs known to confound craving measurement (Kavanagh et al., 2013; Sayette et al., 2000). By retaining the items most representative of the ACE factors, and monitoring the resultant model fit, the MACE preserved the construct validity of the ACE. The MACE subsequently retains the capacity for unique insight into intensity and intrusiveness of patient craving, as well as the prevalence of craving based imagery. This information may inform case formulation and treatment planning.

Predictive validity is infrequently examined in existing craving measures. Higher scores on the MACE was predictive of increased risk of lapse or dropout from treatment in this alcohol dependent sample. The MACE may therefore assist addiction professionals to better assess risk of relapse in their patients.

Few craving measures assess test-retest reliability. The MACE deliberately measures past week frequency of craving, under the assumption that this will have greater stability and subsequently be a more reliable indicator of change than single time point assessments. The correlation of session one and two MACE scores was $r = .73$, and is interpreted as an acceptable degree of stability within the clinical context. Given the prominence of craving within clinical and research settings, a measure of craving sensitive to change over time is greatly needed. The MACE may enhance the validity of studies assessing the efficacy of craving interventions, and improve monitoring of patients' treatment response in clinical settings.

As this study was conducted in a hospital outpatient clinic, the samples provided optimal, clinically relevant data. However, the practical nature of the research design introduced some limitations. The samples predominantly comprised middle-aged men with poor social or occupational functioning and moderate to severe alcohol dependence. Future studies should investigate the MACE in more diverse patient populations, as craving profiles may vary across problem severity, age, culture, social-occupational status. An additional limitation is that follow up data of patients who dropped out were not available. and were conservatively recorded as having lapsed. Assessment of test-retest reliability was also impaired by the treatment setting. An increased focus on drinking and attempts to change drinking behaviours is likely to have increased variance in patient craving from session one to two. While this is hypothesised to have led to the underestimation of the MACE's stability, future research should assess participants under stable conditions with tightly controlled time

points. Finally, while craving frequency presents ongoing challenges to the control of drinking, very intense peak levels also constitute significant risk. Utilising both frequency and strength forms of the ACE is recommended when time permits, as they offer a more comprehensive assessment of the patient's experience of craving. All ACE scales, scoring instructions, and normative data are included in the online supplementary material.

The Mini Alcohol Craving Experience (MACE) reflects the key theoretical elements of the ACE, while maintaining the best performing items and preserving psychometric integrity. Key strengths of the MACE include excellent construct validity, predictive validity, and acceptable test-retest reliability. In conjunction with its brevity, these features make the MACE ideal for use with AUD populations in time limited clinical and research environments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Jason Connor is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia Career Development Fellowship (1031909). Matthew Gullo is supported by a NHMRC Early Career Fellowship (1036365). We would like to acknowledge Annie McPherson, Jane Tucker, Karen Dillman, and Daniel Park at the Alcohol and Drug Assessment Unit for their assistance in this research.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

Abrams DB (2000) Transdisciplinary concepts and measures of craving: commentary and future directions. Addiction 95**:**237-246.

Addolorato G, Leggio L, Abenavoli L, Gasbarrini G (2005) Neurobiochemical and clinical aspects of craving in alcohol addiction: a review. Addict. Behav. 30**:**1209-1224.

American Psychiatric Association, (2000) Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. 4th ed. TR ed., American Psychiatric Association, Washington, DC.

American Psychiatric Association (2013) Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. 5th ed. ed., American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D.C.

Anton RF, Moak DH, Latham P (1995) The obsessive compulsive drinking scale: a self-rated instrument for the quantification of thoughts about alcohol and drinking behavior. Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res. 19**:**92-99.

Barnes LLB, Harp D, Jung WS (2002) Reliability generalization of scores on the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Educ. Psychol. Meas. 62**:**603-618.

Beck AT, Steer RA, Brown GK (1996) Beck Depression Inventory-II: Manual, Psychological Corp, San Antonio.

Beck AT, Steer RA, Carbin MG (1988) Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory: twenty-five years of evaluation. Clin. Psychol. Rev. 8**:**77-100.

Connor JP, Haber PS, Hall WD (2016) Alcohol use disorders. LANCET 387**:**988-998.

Connor JP, Hall WD (2015) Alcohol burden in low-income and middle-income countries. 386**:**1922-1924.

Connor JP, Kavanagh DJ, Andrade J, May J, Feeney GFX, Gullo MJ, White AM, Fry ML, Drennan J, Previte J, Tjondronegoro D (2014) Alcohol consumption in young adults: the role of multisensory imagery. Addict. Behav. 39**:**721-724.

Cortina JM (1993) What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. J. Appl. Psychol. 78**:**98-104.

Flannery BA, Poole SA, Gallop RJ, Volpicelli JR (2003) Alcohol craving predicts drinking during treatment: an analysis of three assessment instruments. J. Stud. Alcohol 64**:**120-126.

Gowing LR, Ali RL, Allsop S, Marsden J, Turf EE, West R, Witton J (2015) Global statistics on Addict. Behav.: 2014 status report. Addiction 110**:**904-919.

Haass-Koffler CL, Leggio L, Kenna Ga (2014) Pharmacological approaches to reducing craving in patients with Alcohol Use Disorders. CNS Drugs 28**:**343-360.

Hasin DS, O'Brien CP, Auriacombe M, Borges G, Bucholz K, Budney A, Compton WM, Crowley T, Ling W, Petry NM, Schuckit M, Grant BF (2013) DSM-5 criteria for substance use disorders: recommendations and rationale. Am. J. Psychiatry 170**:**834-851.

Hruschka DJ, Schwartz D, St.John DC, Picone-Decaro E, Jenkins RA, Carey JW (2004) Reliability in coding open-ended data: lessons learned from HIV behavioral research. Field Methods 16**:**307-331.

Hsu A, Yang J, Yilmaz YH, Haque MS, Can C, Blandford AE (2014) Persuasive technology for overcoming food cravings and improving snack choices, in Proceedings of the 32nd annual ACM conference on Human factors in computing systems, pp 3403-3412.

Kavanagh DJ, Andrade J, May J (2005) Imaginary relish and exquisite torture: the elaborated intrusion theory of desire. Psychol. Rev. 112**:**446-467.

Kavanagh DJ, Statham DJ, Feeney GFX, Young RM, May J, Andrade J, Connor JP (2013) Measurement of alcohol craving. Addict. Behav. 38**:**1572-1584.

Kemps E, Tiggemann M (2007) Modality-specific imagery reduces cravings for food: an application of the elaborated intrusion theory of desire to food craving. J. Exp. Psychol. Appl. 13**:**95-104.

Kemps E, Tiggemann M (2013) Hand-held dynamic visual noise reduces naturally occurring food cravings and craving-related consumption. Appetite 68**:**152-157.

Knäuper B, Pillay R, Lacaille J, McCollam A, Kelso E (2011) Replacing craving imagery with alternative pleasant imagery reduces craving intensity. Appetite 57**:**173-178.

Kranzler HR, Mulgrew CL, Modesto-Lowe V, Burleson JA (1999) Validity of the Obsessive Compulsive Drinking Scale (OCDS): does craving predict drinking behavior? Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res. 23**:**108-114.

Law B, Gullo MJ, Daglish M, Kavanagh DJ, Feeney GFX, Young RM, Connor JP (2016) Craving Mediates Stress in Predicting Lapse During Alcohol Dependence Treatment. Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res. 40**:**1058-1064.

Littel M, Hout MAVD, Engelhard IM (2016) Desensitizing addiction: using eye Movements to reduce the intensity of substance-related Mental imagery and craving. Front. Psychiatry 7**:**1-11.

May J, Andrade J, Kavanagh DJ, Feeney GFX, Gullo MJ, Statham DJ, Skorka-Brown J, Connolly JM, Cassimatis M, Young RM, Connor JP (2014) The Craving Experience Questionnaire: a brief, theory-based measure of consummatory desire and craving. Addiction 109**:**728-735.

May J, Kavanagh DJ, Andrade J (2014) The Elaborated Intrusion Theory of desire : a 10-year retrospective and implications for addiction treatments. Addict. Behav. 44**:**1-6.

McHugh, RK, Fitzmaurice, GM, Griffin, ML, Anton, RF, Weiss, RD (2016) Association between a brief alcohol craving measure and drinking in the following week. Addiction 111:1004–1010.

Oei TP, Evans L, Crook GM (1990) Utility and validity of the STAI with anxiety disorder patients. Br. J. Clin. Psychol .29**:**429-432.

Pavlick M, Hoffmann E, Rosenberg H (2009) A nationwide survey of American alcohol and drug craving assessment and treatment practices. Addict. Res. Theory 17**:**591-600.

R-Core Team (2015) A language and environment for statistical computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.

Roberts JS, Anton RF, Latham PK, Moak DH (1999) Factor structure and predictive validity of the Obsessive Compulsive Drinking Scale. Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res. 23**:**1484-1491.

Robinson TE, Berridge KC (1993) The neural basis of drug craving: an incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. Brain Res. Rev. 18**:**247-291.

Rosseel Y (2012) lavaan: an R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. J. Stat. Softw. 48**:**1-36.

Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, de la Fuente JR, Grant M (1993) Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption--II. Addiction 88**:**791-804.

Sayette MA, Shiffman S, Tiffany ST, Niaura RS, Martin CS, Shadel WG (2000) The measurement of drug craving. Addiction 95**:**189-210.

Skorka-Brown J, Andrade J, May J (2014) Playing 'Tetris' reduces the strength, frequency and vividness of naturally occurring cravings. Appetite 76**:**161-165.

Spielberger C (1983) Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto: California.

Statham DJ, Connor JP, Kavanagh DJ, Feeney GFX, Young RMD, May J, Andrade J (2011) Measuring alcohol craving: development of the Alcohol Craving Experience Questionnaire. Addiction 106**:**1230-1238.

R-Core Team (2015) A language and environment for statistical computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.

Tiffany ST, Wray JM (2012) The clinical significance of drug craving. Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 1248**:**1-17.

Witkiewitz K, Bowen S, Douglas H, Hsu SH (2013) Mindfulness-based relapse prevention for substance craving. Addict. Behav. 38**:**1563-1571.

Witkiewitz K, Bowen S, Harrop EN, Douglas H, Enkema M, Sedgwick C (2014) Mindfulness-based treatment to prevent addictive behavior relapse: theoretical models and hypothesized mechanisms of change. Subst. Use Misuse. 49**:**513-524.

Rojewski, AM, Morean, ME, Toll, B, McKee, S, Krishnan-Sarin, S, Green, BG, Bartoshuk, LM, O'Malley, SS (2015) The Yale Craving Scale: development and psychometric properties. Drug Alcohol Depend. 154:158–166.

Table 1. Patient sample characteristics

Sample characteristics	Scale Reduction Sample *n* = 519	Validation Sample *n* = 228	TRT Sample *n* = 66
Mean Age, years (SD)	39.82 (11.59)	44.39 (10.82)	45.48 (10.03)
Sex, female	171 (32.9%)	84 (36.8%)	22 (33.3)
Married/*De-facto*	184 (35.5%%)	82 (36.0%)	25 (37.9%)
Education			
Degree	70 (13.5%)	47 (20.5%)	17 (25.8%)
Diploma/Certificate	52 (10.0%)	16 (7.1%)	6 (9.1%)
Senior Secondary (Year 12)	157 (30.3%)	71 (31.1%)	22 (33.3%)
Junior Secondary (Year 10)	190 (36.6%)	82 (36.0%)	17 (25.8%)
Primary (Year 7)	33 (6.4%)	11 (4.8%)	4 (6.1%)
Unemployed	103 (19.8%)	44 (19.3%)	15 (22.7%)
Mean Alcohol (grams) per drinking day (SD)	147.07 (88.90)	169.80 (100.93)	196.12 (119.71)
Median Baseline ACE-F (IQR)	39 (48.00)	42.00 (46.75)	43.50 (45.50)
Mean Baseline AUDIT (IQR)	27.25 (8.6)	29.38 (7.01)	27.47 (10.28)
Medication Prescribed*	315 (60.7%)	25 (11.0%)	10 (15.2%)

*The Scale Reduction Sample records medication (naltrexone/acamprosate/both) if it is prescribed at any point during treatment. Medication is only counted in the Validation and TRT samples if it was taken in the week prior to assessment. As the Validation sample assessment occurred prior to commencement of behavioural treatment and TRT sample was assessed in Session 1, the majority of patients had not yet been prescribed pharmacotherapy.

Table 2. Percentiles, Interquartile Ranges, and Endorsement Rates (ER) of ACE-F Items.

		Percentile				
How often did these things happen over the last week?	*n*	25	50	75	IQR	ER (%)
1. Did you want a drink?	518	2	5	7	5	87.6
2. Did you think about needing a drink?	519	1	3	7	6	80.2
3. Did you have an urge to drink?	519	2	5	8	6	86.1
4. Did you picture alcohol or drinking?	519	1	3	6	5	80.9
5. Did you imagine what it would taste like?	518	0	2	6	6	73.0
6. Did you imagine what it would smell like?	519	0	1	4	4	61.3
7. Did you imagine what it would feel like in your mouth or throat?	519	0	2	5	5	67.1
8. Did you imagine how your body would feel if you had a drink?	518	1	4	7	6	80.1
9. When you thought about alcohol over the last week, how often were the thoughts intrusive?	507	1	4	7	6	84.9
10. When you thought about alcohol over the last week, how often were you trying not to think about alcohol?	517	1	5	8	7	83.8
11. Did you find it hard to think about anything else?	516	1	2	5	4	75.8

Table 3. Mean rank comparison of abstinent patients and those who lapsed or dropped out of treatment across all ACE-F items scores.

How often did these things happen over the last week?	Complete Abstinent		Lapse or Dropout					
	n	Mean Rank	*n*	Mean Rank	U	Z	*p*	*r*
1. Did you want a drink?	118	196.24	398	276.96	16135.00	-5.19	<.001	-0.23
2. Did you think about needing a drink?	118	203.00	399	275.56	16933.00	-4.67	<.001	-0.20
3. Did you have an urge to drink?	118	203.95	399	275.28	17045.00	-4.58	<.001	-0.20
4. Did you picture alcohol or drinking?	118	215.42	399	271.89	18398.50	-3.64	<.001	-0.16
5. Did you imagine what it would taste like?	118	215.79	398	271.16	18442.50	-3.59	<.001	-0.16
6. Did you imagine what it would smell like?	118	217.61	399	271.24	18656.50	-3.54	<.001	-0.16
7. Did you imagine what it would feel like in your mouth or throat?	118	214.71	399	272.10	18315.00	-3.74	<.001	-0.16
8. Did you imagine how your body would feel if you had a drink?	118	223.04	398	269.01	19298.00	-2.96	0.003	-0.13
9. When you thought about alcohol over the last week, how often were the thoughts intrusive?	117	223.46	388	261.91	19241.50	-2.51	0.012	-0.11

10. When you thought about alcohol over the last week, how often were you trying not to think about alcohol?	117	211.29	398	271.73	17818	-3.88	<.001	-0.17
11. Did you find it hard to think about anything else?	118	203.59	399	275.56	17003	-4.55	<.001	-0.20

Table 4. Robust fit indices for the 3-factor and unifactorial structures of the ACE scales (*n* = 228).

Scale	*χ2 (df)*	*χ2 /df*	*p*	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC
ACE-F 11							
Unifactorial	302.13 (44)	6.87	<.001	0.898	0.160	0.069	11236.7
3-Factor	158.92 (41)	3.88	<.001	0.954	0.112	0.056	11013.50
ACE-F 7							
Unifactorial	78.91 (14)	5.64	<.001	0.955	0.143	0.040	7321.29
3-Factor	35.59 (11)	3.24	<.001	0.983	0.099	0.027	7265.35
ACE-F 5							
Unifactorial	13.72 (5)	2.74	0.017	0.988	0.087	0.031	5410.49
3-Factor	13.07 (4)	3.27	0.011	0.987	0.100	0.030	5412.35

Table 5. Correlations between the ACE-F scales and the OBS, OCDS, AUDIT, S-Anxiety, and BDI

	OBS	OCDS Total	AUDIT	S-Anxiety	BDI
ACE-F 11	.598***	.547***	.215***	.381***	.380***
ACE-F 7	.585***	.543***	.196**	.401***	.388***
ACE-F 5	.583***	.542***	.211***	.385***	.382***

***p<.01, ***p<.001*

Table 6. Cronbach's alphas and correlations between session one and two ACE scale scores.

	α	*r*
ACE-F 11	0.946	.731***
Intensity	0.940	.718***
Imagery	0.917	.741***
Intrusion	0.807	.636***
ACE-F 7	0.919	.725***
Intensity	0.908	.672***
Imagery	0.866	.732***
Intrusion	0.641	.632***
ACE-F 5	0.922	.728***